



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/025,784	12/26/2001	Kiwamu Tanahashi	HIRA.0020	5890

7590

11/20/2003

Stanley P. Fisher
Reed Smith Hazel & Thomas LLP
Suite 1400
3110 Fairview Park Drive
Falls Church, VA 22042-4503

EXAMINER

RICKMAN, HOLLY C

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1773

DATE MAILED: 11/20/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

ab8

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/025,784

Applicant(s)

TANAHASHI ET AL.

Examiner

Holly Rickman

Art Unit

1773

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 August 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2 and 4-9 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2 and 4-9 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892). 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____. 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The rejection of claims 1-2 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Honda et al. (IEEE Trans. Magn., Vol. 36, No. 5, September 2000, pp. 2399-2401) is withdrawn in view of the amendments to the claims.

2. The rejection of claims 1-2 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by JP 2001-283419 is withdrawn in view of the filing of a certified translation of the foreign priority document.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102/103

3. The rejection of claims 4-6 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Honda et al. (IEEE Trans. Magn., Vol. 36, No. 5, September 2000, pp. 2399-2401) is withdrawn in view of Applicant's amendments.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 1773

5. The rejection of claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Honda et al. (IEEE Trans. Magn., Vol. 36, No. 5, September 2000, pp. 2399-2401) in view of Abarra et al. (US 6562489) is withdrawn in view of Applicant's arguments and the cancellation of the claim.

6. The rejection of claims 7-8 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Honda et al. (IEEE Trans. Magn., Vol. 36, No. 5, September 2000, pp. 2399-2401) in view of Tanahashi et al. (US 6001447) is withdrawn in view of Applicant's amendments.

7. Claims 1-2, 4-6 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Honda et al. (IEEE Trans. Magn., Vol. 36, No. 5, September 2000, pp. 2399-2401) in view of Chen et al. (US 6120890).

Honda et al. disclose a magnetic recording medium having a $\text{FeTa}_8\text{C}_{12}$ soft magnetic layer disposed on a substrate. The ratio of Ta concentration to C concentration in this alloy is about 0.67. The reference teaches that a nonmagnetic CoCr intermediate layer is deposited on the soft magnetic layer followed by a perpendicular magnetic recording layer (see Section II. EXPERIMENTAL PROCEDURE and Table 1).

Honda et al. teach all of the limitations of the claims except for the presence of an amorphous or nanocrystalline layer between the substrate and the soft magnetic layer.

Chen et al. teach the equivalence of an amorphous NiP plated Al substrate and a glass substrate in a conventional magnetic recording medium (col. 1, lines 43-51). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to substitute a NiP-plated Al

Art Unit: 1773

substrate for the glass substrate disclosed by Honda et al. in view of Chen's teaching of the art recognized equivalence of the materials.

Chen et al. also teach that amorphous NiP may be plated on glass to prevent leaching of any Li that may be present in the glass (see col. 1, lines 15-21; col. 4, lines 42-47). As such, it would have been obvious to plate an amorphous NiP layer on the glass layer taught by Honda et al. in order to achieve this benefit.

With respect to claims 4-6, Honda et al. disclose all of the limitations of the claims except for the value of $H_{c||}$. However, the reference does disclose using a $FeTa_8C_{12}$ soft magnetic layer and the present specification teaches that this particular alloy produces the claimed $H_{c||}$ values (see p. 9, Table 3).

Thus, it is the Examiner's contention that the structure taught by Honda et al. inherently satisfies the limitations of the claims directed to $H_{c||}$ by virtue of the fact that $FeTa_8C_{12}$ is used for the soft magnetic layer.

It has been held that where claimed and prior art products are identical or substantially identical, or are produced by identical or substantially identical processes, the burden of proof is shifted to applicant to show that prior art products do not necessarily or inherently possess characteristics of claimed products where the rejection is based on inherency under 35 USC §102 or on prima facie obviousness under 35 USC §103, jointly or alternatively. *In re Best, Bolton, and Shaw*, 195 USPQ 430. (CCPA 1977).

8. Claims 7-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Honda et al. (IEEE Trans. Magn., Vol. 36, No. 5, September 2000, pp. 2399-2401) in view of Chen et al. (US

Art Unit: 1773

6120890) as applied to claims 1-2, 4-6, and 9, above, and further in view of Tanahashi et al. (US 6001447).

Honda et al. in view of Chen et al. teach all of the limitations of the claims except for the exact details of the recording apparatus for use therewith.

Tanahashi et al. teach that it is known in the art to use a magnetic recording medium in conjunction with a driving means for moving the recording medium, a magnetoresistive magnetic head, driving means for moving the magnetic head, and a signal processing unit (see abstract).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the magnetic recording medium taught by Honda et al. with the conventional magnetic recording apparatus components taught by Tanahashi et al. in order to form a functional disk drive.

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments filed 8/28/03 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Holly Rickman whose telephone number is (703) 305-2642. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Paul J. Thibodeau can be reached on (703) 308-2367. The fax phone numbers for the

Art Unit: 1773

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9310 for regular communications and (703) 872-9311 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0661.



Holly Rickman
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1773

hcr
November 12, 2003